

Message

From: Brasaemle, Karla [Karla.Brasaemle@TechLawInc.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 1:22:35 AM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Curbed - Follow-up questions

Hi John,

Yes, you are correct. There are 3 more reports. The Parcel C report and all of the forms (we are examining the forms for trenches, former building sites, and fill units to look for falsification not identified by the Navy) have been reviewed – Lily has that information. However, we are still in the beginning stages of reviewing the other two documents and the Parcel E forms.

Karla Brasaemle, P.G.,
TechLaw, Inc.
415-762-0566

From: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 5:08 PM
To: Brasaemle, Karla <Karla.Brasaemle@TechLawInc.com>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Curbed - Follow-up questions

Karla, one more question. Am I correct that the only reports we haven't commented to the Navy on yet are the Data Eval Reports for Parcels E and C and the Buildings. I think we have those and are not expecting any other reports? Is that right?

Thanks, John

From: Brasaemle, Karla [<mailto:Karla.Brasaemle@TechLawInc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 10:58 AM
To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Media query - SF Curbed - Follow-up questions

Hi John,

I'm at the Battelle Conference and have limited availability between talks. So email is easier...

1. EPA has not done any rescanning of whole parcels after the TetraTech remediation.
2. Building 322 was on Parcel A just before transfer (former badge office) – the HRA came out and TechLaw/EPA identified this building as the one that had been moved from Parcel D. Transfer was delayed so the potential rad contamination could be addressed. The building was demolished, piping was removed, and TT scanned the footprint. To confirm that the former building site was clean, Steve Dean did an independent scan of the entire site. Steve did not detect anything, so the site was determined to be transferable without restriction. So yes, we should stand by our previous statements.

There is no single old report that covers all of the buildings, but each Parcel has a radiological RACR that includes the FSSRs for all of the buildings as well as the SUPRs for all of the trenches (these can be downloaded from DTSC's Envirostor). The Navy just issued their Draft Rad Buildings Evaluation – I haven't read it yet, but it may only cover a subset of buildings, given the size of the report (pretty small). The City of SF will provide a copy of that report if asked, although EPA and the Navy do not release Draft Reports .

Please let me know if you have more questions...I will check my email in another couple of hours.

Karla Brasaemle, P.G.,
TechLaw, Inc.
415-762-0566

From: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:26 AM
To: Brasaemle, Karla <Karla.Brasaemle@TechLawInc.com>
Subject: Fwd: Media query - SF Curbed - Follow-up questions

Karla, if you are around today, maybe you can read this and call me at your convenience to discuss. No need to write up anything. You are just more familiar with this issue than I, esp in Lily's absence.

Thanks,

John
972-3005

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Huitric, Michele" <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>
Date: April 11, 2018 at 5:13:57 PM PDT
To: "Chesnutt, John" <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>, "Fairbanks, Brianna" <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>
Cc: "Huitric, Michele" <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>, "Harris-Bishop, Rusty" <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Subject: Media query - SF Curbed - Follow-up questions

Hi ~

Here are follow-up questions from Chris Roberts (our original response is at bottom of email)

Q1: Was the "scanner van" also used to scan other parcels on the shipyard remediated by the Navy? If so, where and when? *[I pointed him to the section of scanner report that explained which parcels were scanned, and he clarified his question as follows:]* Were the other parcels scanned by EPA *after* Tetra Tech remediation work in the years that followed, i.e. 2004 to 2016?

Q2: You say that Building 322 was scanned by the Navy and demolished, and that EPA has "no reason to question any cleanup work" on that Parcel. However, according to the Navy, Building 322 was scanned by Tetra Tech, the same firm whose data is now called into question all over the base. And according to the draft radiological findings report for buildings, there was no data for that building. Does EPA's contention that there is "no reason to question" the work stand, in light of Tetra Tech's apparent fraud? If so, how can we trust this work, and not other work?

I don't know the answer for Q1, has there been additional scanning?

As for Q2, do you want to say that we stand by our previous statement?

Side note – he has been asking about a "findings report on buildings" and DTSC's response to Inside EPA references such a report also referred to such a report ("DTSC is also reviewing Navy Radiological Data

Evaluation Findings Reports for soil in other parcels where Tetra Tech EC conducted radiological work (Parcels B, C, UC-1, UC-2, D-2, and E), and also one report that covers all buildings within those parcels.”). Is that a report that we have seen?

Thanks,
Michele

From: Huitric, Michele

Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 9:58 AM

To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>; LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Lane, Jackie <Lane.Jackie@epa.gov>; Huang, Judy <Huang.Judy@epa.gov>

Cc: Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>

Subject: Final response to SF Curbed

FYI – HQ signed off on our SF Curbed response. Here is what I sent Chris Roberts this morning.

Questions:

- Wanted to see what the best way to discuss with EPA the findings from the most recent radiological findings report from the Hunters Point shipyard -- these, related to buildings -- might be. As the report says, the cleanup data from buildings appears to have been falsified--but the report also says that a building on Parcel A, building 322, was scanned and declared clear by Tetra Tech back in 2004. Based on what we know now, can that declaration be trusted? And in any event, how can we be certain that that building is in fact clean and poses no danger to the environment or the public--and what, if any, actions will be taken as a result? [Also, paraphrased from reporter's voicemail: Whistleblowers have declared that Parcel A had contamination; how are those concerns being addressed?]
- Also, it looks like the EPA is also reviewing Tetra Tech's data. Has EPA produced comments on all of the Navy's draft radiological findings reports? Will EPA provide copies of all comments on the draft radiological findings reports produced to date?
- Today, an organization called PEER put out a release in which the EPA's comments on the US Navy's draft radiological findings reports from the former Navy shipyard at Hunters Point in San Francisco, an EPA Superfund site, were published. But only the EPA comments on Parcels B and G were obtained. Has the EPA commented on the draft radiological findings reports from the other parcels? If so, can EPA provide those documents?
- I understand that prior to the transfer, EPA ran a "scan van" over Parcel A and collected its own cleanup data to verify the Navy's. Is that accurate? Can you provide those findings? And was the "scan van" run over other parts of the base after other Navy cleanup?

Response:

We have no reason to question any cleanup work performed on Parcel A. Historically, the majority of Parcel A was used for residences and administrative offices, not industrial activities.

The only radiological materials found at Parcel A were sandblast grit and firebricks, these have since been removed. Former Buildings 322, 816, and 821 had potential for radiological contamination. The Navy scanned all three buildings and did not find radiological contamination above required cleanup levels. Buildings 322 and 816 were demolished and removed. Building 821 is located on Crisp Road, not in the developed portion of Parcel A. No other sources of radiological contamination were identified during the investigation or cleanup of Parcel A. In 2002, EPA conducted a radiological scanner van survey of Parcel A and navigable roads on other parts of the Shipyard (please see attached report). All of the

anomalies detected during the scan were attributable to natural occurring sources at levels consistent with what would normally be found in the environment.

Please see attached for copies of EPA's independent review of Parcels B and G (attachment #1) and Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 (attachment #2). Please note, for the report on Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 (attachment #2), there is a small typo in Table 2. Where it says "71%" in the last row of Table 2, it should actually say "85%". Please let us know if you have any specific questions about these reports.

EPA is pleased that the Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and relying on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done.